

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/747,961	12/31/2003	Eugene George Olczak	040849-0248 6224		
22428 75	590 11/22/2005		EXAMINER		
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			LEE, GUIYOUNG		
SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	WASHINGTON, DG 20007			2875	
•			DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/747,961	OLCZAK, EUGENE GEORGE			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Guiyoung Lee	2875			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was realized to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-17 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	·			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0604, 0405.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/747,961 Page 2

Art Unit: 2875

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase "the method" has insufficient antecedent basis in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 15 depends from claim 18. However, there is no claim 18. Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

3. Claim 17 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 13. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 5. Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamashita et al. (US 6,874,902 B2).

Application/Control Number: 10/747,961 Page 3

Art Unit: 2875

6. Re claims 1-3, 6-7, and 10-17: Yamashita discloses a back light display device having an optical source, a light guide, and optical substrate, and the optical substrate having a plurality of prism structure having two curved sides (See Fig. 1 and 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ookawa et al. (US 6,628,460 B1).

Re claims 8-9: Yamashita does not disclose the peak angle of the prism structure and the refractive index. However, Ookawa discloses an optical substrate having a prism structure characterized by a peak angle in the range of 80 degree to 100 degree (col. 5, line 58) and a refractive index of 1.6 or more (col. 5, line 65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the peak angle and refractive index in order to enhance the luminance of the planar light source device (col. 5, line 50-67).

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 4-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: With regard to claims 4-5, the prior art of record does not disclose the claimed optical substrate having a prism structure characterized by a cross section having curved sides described by the equation as set forth in the claims.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Guiyoung Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-2374. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 571-272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/747,961

Art Unit: 2875

LGY

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800 Page 5